



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/825,521	04/02/2001	Ian Catley	112740-188	9765
29177	7590	03/30/2004	EXAMINER	
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLC			SING, SIMON P	
P. O. BOX 1135			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, IL 60690-1135			2645	
DATE MAILED: 03/30/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/825,521	CATLEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Simon Sing	2645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,4,5 and 8-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 3,6 and 7 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Orui US 6,049,601.

1.1 Regarding claim 1, Orui discloses a method for call forwarding. Orui teaches: entering a telephone number (of second subscriber terminal 10) from which calls are to be forwarded (origin of call redirection) (figure 3, step B7; column 4, lines 38-63), and a telephone number for which calls are forwarded to (destination of call redirection) (figure 3, step B10; column 5, lines 9-14) from telephone 13 (first subscriber terminal); storing both telephone numbers in a memory associated with telephone 13 in central processing unit 14 (figure 1) (column 4, lines 59-67; column 5, lines 9-14); checking call forwarding not being set up (column 4, lines 38-44); and storing both telephone numbers in a memory associated with the second subscriber terminal 10 and setting up the call forwarding (column 5, lines 14-20).

1.2 Regarding claim 8, Orui teaches signaling audibly (DTMF tones) on the first subscriber terminal.

1.3 Regarding claim 9, Orui teaches deactivated call forwarding (column 5, lines 21-56).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orui US 6,049,601 in view of McClure et al. 4,807,279.

Orui teaches remotely programming call forwarding, but fails to specifically teach checking if call forwarding is already exist.

However, McClure discloses a method for call forwarding. McClure teaches checking whether a call forward flag is set. If the flag is set, the call forwarding is exist and a computer program for call alteration is called (column 7, lines 19-33, 44-67; column 8, lines 1-2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Orui's reference with the teaching of

McClure, so call forwarding activation status would have been checked first to determine whether present call forwarding request being a call forwarding activation, or a call forwarding alteration, and a appropriate computer program would have been called to execute said request, because such a modification would have enabled a user not only for call forwarding, but also call forwarding alterations.

3. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orui US 6,049,601 in view of Plomondon et al. US 5,729,599.

Orui teaches forwarding calls to the first subscriber terminal, and storing a telephone number for call forwarding in a memory associated with the second subscriber terminal, but fails to teach the memory stores an acceptance group of telephone numbers.

However, Plomondon discloses a method for forwarding telephone calls in figures 1- 3. Plomondon teaches storing a group of accepted forwarding number in a user profile (column 9, lines 53-62; column 10, lines 59-67; column 11, lines 1-19).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Orui's reference with the teaching of Plomondon, so that a forwarding telephone number would have been verified before performing call forwarding, because such a modification would have avoided forwarding a call to an undesirable telephone number.

4. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orui US 6,049,601 in view of Davison et al. US 4,873,717.

Orui teaches forwarding calls to the first subscriber terminal, but fails to teach signal for call acceptance on the second subscriber terminal and at least one other subscriber terminal.

However, Davison discloses a call coverage arrangement in that a call accepted by one telephone terminal is signaled on other terminal in same group of telephone terminals each having a distinct directory number, and one of these telephone terminals may answer the call if the primary telephone terminal does not answer the call (column 9, lines 33-67; column 10, lines 1-3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Orui's reference with the teaching of Davidson, so that a call acceptance would have been signaled on a grouped subscriber terminals, because such a modification would have enabled other subscriber terminal to answer and incoming call in case the intended subscriber terminal did not answer the incoming call.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 and 3-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

6 Claims 3, 6, and 7 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

6.1 Claim 3 teaches a method for redirecting call forwarding, in that a user enters call redirection information at a first subscriber terminal to change call forwarding destination for a second subscriber terminal. After call redirection has been set up, a message containing the call redirection information is sent to the second subscriber terminal, which forwarded previous calls to the first subscriber terminal. Orui teaches entering call forwarding information from a first telephone to change calls for a second telephone be forwarded to the first telephone. Orui fails to teach sending a message containing the call forwarding information to the second telephone which previously forwarding calls to the first telephone.

6.2 Claim 6 teaches a method for redirecting call forwarding, in that a user enters call redirection information at a first subscriber terminal to change call forwarding destination for a second subscriber terminal. After call redirection has been set up, a message, containing the call redirection information, including call forwarding activation and deactivation, is sent to the another subscriber terminal. A memory associated with the another subscriber terminal is searched to compare the call redirection information, and

updating call redirection information stored in the memory based on comparing. Orui teaches entering call forwarding information from a first telephone to change calls for a second telephone be forwarded to the first telephone. Orui fails to teach sending a message, containing the call forwarding information, including call forwarding activation and deactivation, to a third telephone and storing the call forwarding information in a memory associated with the third telephone.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a) Hanle et al. US 5,012,511 discloses a method for remote call forwarding.
- b) Kung et al. US 6,687,360 discloses a method for remote call forwarding.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Simon Sing whose telephone number is (703) 305-3221. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang, can be reached at (703) 305-4895. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

Application/Control Number: 09/825,521
Art Unit: 2645

Page 8



S.S.

03/19/2004

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

